

Amendment; was approved 09/28/95; OMB No. 2060-0256; expires 05/31/96.

EPA ICR No. 1442.09; Land Disposal Restrictions; was approved 09/29/95; OMB No. 2050-0085; expires 09/30/98.

EPA ICR No. 1679.02; Federal Standards of Marine Tank Vessel Loading and Unloading Operations and National Emission Standards for Hazardous Air Pollutants for Marine Tank Vessel Loading and Unloading Operation; was approved 09/25/95; OMB No. 2060-0289; expires 09/30/98.

EPA ICR No. 1352.03; Community Right-to-Know Reporting Requirements (EPCRA Sections 311 and 312); was approved 09/29/95; OMB No. 2050-0072; expires 01/31/97.

EPA ICR No. 1756.01; Open Market Trading Rule (OMTR) for Ozone Precursors; was approved 09/28/95; OMB No. 2060-0344; expires 09/30/98.

EPA ICR No. 1230.08; Prevention of Significant Deterioration and Nonattainment Area Source Review; was approved 09/21/95; OMB No. 2060-0003; expires 03/31/97.

EPA ICR No. 1759.01; Worker Protection Standard; was approved 09/29/95; OMB No. 2070-0148; expires 02/28/97.

Withdrawals

EPA ICR No. 1760.01; Significance of Effects Resulting from Exposure to Irritant Gases; A Survey of Respiratory Physicians and Scientists; was withdrawn by EPA on 09/22/95.

EPA ICR No. 1758.01; Measures of Success for Compliance Assistance Reporting Form; was withdrawn by EPA 09/28/95.

EPA ICR No. 1754.01; Opinions of New York State Community Leaders and Residents Related to Environmental Quality in and Around Lake Ontario; was withdrawn by EPA 09/29/95.

Dated: October 5, 1995.

Joseph Retzer,

Director, Regulatory Information Division.

[FR Doc. 95-25347 Filed 10-12-95; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6560-50-M

[ER-FRL-5229-7]

Environmental Impact Statements and Regulations; Availability of EPA Comments

Availability of EPA comments prepared September 25, 1995 Through September 29, 1995 pursuant to the Environmental Review Process (ERP), under Section 309 of the Clean Air Act and Section 102(2)(c) of the National Environmental Policy Act as amended. Requests for copies of EPA comments can be directed to the Office of Federal Activities at (202) 260-5076.

An explanation of the ratings assigned to draft environmental impact statements (EISs) was published in FR dated April 14, 1995 (60 FR 19047).

Draft EISs

ERP No. D-FHW-G40141-OK Rating EC2, Canadian River Bridge Crossing Construction, MT-37 east of Tuttle northward to MT-152 in or near Mustang, Funding, COE Section 404 and EPA NPDES Permits Issuance, Canadian and Counties, MT.

Summary: EPA expressed environmental concerns regarding cumulative impacts and wetland. EPA requested that the final EIS address these issues in more detail as well as providing information on pesticide use, pollution prevention and environmental justice.

ERP No. D-IBR-J39023-MT Rating EC2, Tongue River Basin Project, Implementation, Tongue River Dam and Reservoir, COE Section 404 Permit, Bighorn County, MT.

Summary: EPA expressed environmental concerns regarding wetland impacts. EPA recommended that other alternatives be analyzed that would avoid these impacts.

ERP No. DR-UAF-B11015-ME Rating LO, Loring Air Force Base (AFB) Disposal and Reuse, Implementation, Updated and Additional Information, Aroostook County, ME.

Summary: EPA had no objections to the proposed action.

Final EISs

ERP No. FS-UAF-B11012-NH, Pease Air Force Base (AFB) Disposal and Reuse, Updated Information, Implementation, Portsmouth, Newington, Greenland, Rye, Dover, Durham, Madburg and Rochester, NH and Kittery, Eloit and Berwicks, ME.

Summary: EPA continues to have environmental concerns regarding wetland and air quality impacts. EPA recommended that all major wetlands be protected by deed restrictions.

Dated: October 10, 1995.

William D. Dickerson,

Director, NEPA Compliance Division Office of Federal Activities.

[FR Doc. 95-25456 Filed 10-12-95; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6560-50-U

[ER-FRL-5229-6]

Environmental Impact Statements; Notice of Availability

Responsible Agency: Office of Federal Activities, General Information (202) 260-5076 OR (202) 260-5075. Weekly receipt of Environmental Impact

Statements Filed October 02, 1995 Through October 06, 1995 Pursuant to 40 CFR 1506.9.

EIS No. 950453, Draft EIS, AFS, AK, 1995 Mendenhall Glacier Recreation Area Management Plan, Implementation, Tongass National Forest, Juneau Ranger District, Chatham Area, AK, Due: November 27, 1995, Contact: Joni Packard (907) 586-8800.

EIS No. 950454, Draft Supplement, FHW, UT, I-15/State Street Corridor Highway and Transit Improvements, Updated Information, Construction between 10800 South Street to 500 North Street, Funding, NPDES and COE 404 Permits, Salt Lake County, UT, Due: December 01, 1995, Contact: William R. Gedris (801) 963-0183.

EIS No. 950455, Final EIS, BOP, LA, Pollock US Penitentiary and Federal Prison Camp (FPC), Construction and Operation and Site Selection of a former World War II Military Installation, Grant Parish, LA, Due: November 13, 1995, Contact: David J. Dorworth (202) 514-6470.

EIS No. 950456, Final EIS, FAA, CA, Burbank-Glendale-Pasadena Airport, Replacement Passenger Terminal Construction, Approval, Los Angeles County, CA, Due: November 13, 1985, Contact: David B. Kessler (310) 725-3615.

EIS No. 950457, Draft EIS, COE, MN, Northwestern Minnesota Basin Flood Control Impoundments, Construction and Operation, Flood Damage Reduction, Red River, St. Paul District, MN, Due: November 27, 1995, Contact: Robert J. Whiting (612) 290-5264.

EIS No. 950458, Draft Supplement, COE, CA, Richmond Harbor Deep Draft Navigation Improvements, Updated and Additional Information, Improve Navigation Efficiency into the Potrero Reach Channel, San Francisco Bay, Contra Costa County, CA, Due: November 28, 1995, Contact: Linda Ngim (415) 744-3345.

EIS No. 950459, Final EIS, BLM, CT, Weir Farm National Historic Site, Implementation, General Management Plan, Possible COE Section 404 Permit, Towns of Ridgefield and Walton, Fairfield County, CT, Due: November 13, 1995, Contact: Bob Fox (203) 544-9829.

EIS No. 950460, Final EIS, FHW, WI, US 151/WI 41 Waupun to Fond du Lac Project, Construction, Funding and Possible COE Section 404 Permit, Fond du Lac County, WI, Due: November 13, 1995, Contact: James Zavoral (608) 264-5944.

Amended Notices

EIS No. 950382, Draft EIS, AFS, MT,
Castle Mountains Allotment
Management Plan, Implementation,
Lewis and Clark National Forest,
Musselshell and King Hill Ranger
Districts, White Sulphur Springs,
Meagher County, MT, Due: November
30, 1995, Contact: Dave Wanderaas
(406) 566-2292.

Published FR 08-18-95—Review
period extended.

Dated: October 10, 1995.

William D. Dickerson,
*Director, NEPA Compliance Division Office
of Federal Activities.*

[FR Doc. 95-25455 Filed 10-12-95; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6560-50-U

FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION

[DA 95-2083]

Approval of Cost Accounting Plan

AGENCY: Federal Communications
Commission.

ACTION: Notice.

SUMMARY: This Order approves Southern New England Telephone Company's (SNET) cost accounting plan for its market trial of video dialtone service. Specifically, we approve the accounting plan filed by SNET in its Description and Justification filed in Transmittal No. 641, on March 9, 1995, as modified by a supplement filed on June 19, 1995. This approval is subject to the following three conditions that must be met within 30 days of publication in the Federal Register. SNET is required to: revise its accounting plan to include subsidiary records that reflect replacement of retired transmission plant with fiber optic and coaxial cable facilities within the VDT trial's geographic areas; provide a detailed explanation, including appropriate documentation, regarding the sufficiency of its internal controls and include an evaluation of internal controls for video dialtone service in its 1995 annual audit of its Cost Allocation Manual. The Commission, granted permission for SNET to perform a market trial of video dialtone service for video only, but stipulated that in the event SNET decided to offer exchange access telephone service over video dialtone facilities, it must first submit and obtain approval of an accounting and cost allocation plan. This action is taken because SNET, in Transmittal 641 proposed to perform its market test of video dialtone service to include both

video and exchange access telephone service.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Tom Quaile, Common Carrier Bureau, Accounting and Audits Division, (202) 418-0838.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: This is a Synopsis of the Commission's Order adopted September 29, 1995 and released September 29, 1995. The complete text of this Order is available for inspection and copying during normal business hours in the FCC Dockets Branch (Room 230), 1919 M Street, N.W., Washington, D.C. 20554 and also may be purchased from the Commission's copy contractor, ITS, at (202) 857-3822, Room 246, 1919 M Street, N.W., Washington, D.C. 20554.

Synopsis of Order

1. This Order conditionally approves an accounting plan filed by SNET. The Commission granted SNET authority under Section 214 to construct a hybrid fiber optic/coaxial cable network for a one year market and technical trial. VDT is normally a combination of video and telephony service however, in its application to provide service, SNET stated that it would initially offer only video in its market trial. The Commission requires LECs that offer VDT and telephony, to establish two sets of subsidiary accounting records: one set to capture the investment, expense and revenue wholly dedicated to VDT; the other set to capture the investment, expense and revenue shared between VDT and other telephone services. Because SNET only proposed video service, the Commission did not impose this accounting requirement but stated that if SNET decided to offer telephone service over the upgraded network during the trial, it must submit and obtain approval of an accounting and cost allocation plan to implement the Commission's accounting requirements. SNET subsequently decided to offer telephony services over its upgraded network during the trial. It therefore filed accounting and cost allocation plans as required under the Commission's VDT specific accounting requirements contained in Responsible Accounting Officer Letter Number 25.

2. RAO 25 requires that LEC's maintain subsidiary records to identify the cost of plant that is replaced or retired due to either the deployment of video dialtone plant or the deployment of fiber optic upgrades as mandated under state authority in study areas where VDT deployment occurs. SNET claims that its decision to upgrade its network facilities with fiber optic coaxial-cable facilities was not

influenced by its decision to offer VDT service and thus it is not required under RAO 25 to maintain subsidiary records for the costs of retired plant. We believe that SNET's accounting plan should contain provisions for recording retired plant irrespective of the underlying reasons that support SNET's decision to construct its I-SNET network. The data and information reported during the course of the trial will allow the Commission to make informed decisions regarding appropriate costing methodologies for VDT services. To ensure that the Commission has sufficient data to make such decisions, we require that SNET's accounting plan include subsidiary records that contain the costs for retirements of transmission facilities within the geographic area in which the trial is conducted.

3. RAO 25 requires that LECs have internal accounting controls and a complete audit trail for each subsidiary account record. SNET's accounting plan proposes to meet this requirement by establishing accounting codes and methods to ensure that employees apply the proper codes. Based on our review of SNET's accounting plan, it appears that SNET has developed adequate internal controls. Nevertheless, because we consider the development and maintenance of internal controls to be crucial to the accuracy of reported VDT costs, we require SNET to provide a more detailed explanation, including documentation, of how its controls provide sufficient safeguards to ensure accurate information. In addition, we require SNET to include an evaluation of its internal controls for VDT allocations and assignments as part of its annual independent CAM audits.

4. This Order addresses only SNET's accounting plan. We believe that, if VDT costs are properly recorded in the accounts, adjustments can be made at a later date if changes in allocation methodologies warrant changes to subsidiary records. Cost allocation issues pertaining to VDT will be addressed in the tariff review process.

5. Accordingly, it is ordered, pursuant to authority contained in Sections 1, 4(i), 218-220 and 403 of the Communications Act of 1934, as amended, 47 U.S.C. 151, 154(i), 218-220 and 403 and Sections 0.91 and 0.291 of the Commission's rules, 47 CFR 0.91 and 0.291, that Southern New England Telephone Company's video dialtone marketing trial accounting plan, is approved subject to the following conditions:

(a) That within 30 days of publication of this Order in the Federal Register, SNET shall revise its accounting plan to include subsidiary records that reflect